

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>N.M., through her Guardians and Grandparents, SALEEM M. and SHAHIDA M., and SALEEM M. and SHAHIDA M. in their own right, Plaintiffs</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:09-CV-969</b>
	:	
	:	
	:	
<b>v.</b>	<b>:</b>	
	:	
	:	
<b>CENTRAL YORK SCHOOL DISTRICT,</b>	<b>:</b>	
<b>Defendant</b>	<b>:</b>	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 23rd day of November, 2010, upon consideration of the report of United States Magistrate Judge William T. Prince (Doc. 48), recommending that defendant's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 32) be granted, and plaintiffs' motion for judgment on the administrative record (Doc. 37) be denied, and, following an independent review of the record and noting that plaintiffs N.M., through her Guardians and Grandparents, filed objections<sup>1</sup> to the report on September 24, 2010 (Doc. 51), and the court finding Judge Prince's analysis to be thorough and well-reasoned, and the court finding plaintiffs' objections to be without merit and squarely addressed by Judge Prince's report, it is hereby ORDERED that:

---

<sup>1</sup> Where objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation are filed, the court must perform a *de novo* review of the contested portions of the report. Supinski v. United Parcel Serv., Civ. A. No. 06-0793, 2009 WL 113796, at \*3 (M.D. Pa. Jan. 16, 2009) (citing Sample v. Diecks, 885 F.2d 1099, 1106 n. 3 (3d Cir. 1989); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c)). "In this regard, Local Rule of Court 72.3 requires 'written objections which . . . specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objection is made and the basis for those objections.'" Id. (citing Shields v. Astrue, Civ. A. No. 07-417, 2008 WL 4186951, at \*6 (M.D. Pa. Sept. 8, 2008)).

1. The report of Magistrate Judge Prince (Doc. 48) is ADOPTED.
2. Defendant's motion for summary judgment and disposition on the administrative record (Doc. 32) is GRANTED, and the decision of the administrative law judge is REVERSED to the extent that it held that the Central York School District failed to provide N.M. with a free appropriate education in the least restrictive environment and the compensatory-education award is hereby VACATED.
3. Plaintiffs' motion for judgment on the administrative record (Doc. 37) is DENIED.
4. The Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE this matter.

S/ Christopher C. Conner  
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
United States District Judge